UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,796	07/15/2003	Francis X. Canning	CANNING.001CP2	7886
	7590 09/12/200 RTENS OLSON & BE	EXAMINER		
2040 MAIN ST	REET	DAY, HERNG DER		
FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2128	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/619,796	CANNING, FRANCIS X.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

		HERRIO BERGERA	2120
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REF	PLY FILED <u>20 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.
app app for	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on lication, applicant must timely file one of the following lication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) 🔲	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) 🛚	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
have been under 37 C set forth in may reduc	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(s of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exists a calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later e any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filin	g the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exterice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
(a)	e proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, $\frac{1}{2}$ They raise new issues that would require further con	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
	 They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	·	ducing or simplifying the issues for
(d)	They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.
4. 🔲 The	e amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
	plicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,
6. Ne	wly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all -allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	
how The Cla Cla	purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the new or amended claims would be rejected is provestatus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: m(s) allowed: m(s) objected to: m(s) rejected: <u>2-39</u> .		I be entered and an explanation of
	m(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
	IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
bec	affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu ause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
ente	affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
	e affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation TFOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
<u>S</u>	e request for reconsideration has been considered bu ee Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowance because:
	ote the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (her:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	i S Shah/ sory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2128		

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

- 1. Independent claim 2 proposes an amended limitation, "producing a decomposition of said interaction matrix by performing matrix operations on said first sub-blocks wherein;" in lines 11-14 of the claim. The amended limitation raises the issue of incomplete.
- 2. Independent claim 22 proposes a newly added limitation, "describing at least a portion of said system of linear equations" in lines 14-15 of the claim. The newly added limitation raises the issue of indefinite. For example, claim 22 recites "said a portion" in line 17 of the claim. It becomes indefinite because it is unclear whether the recited "said a portion" is referred to the newly added "a portion" as recited in line 14 of the claim or "a portion" as recited in line 16 of the claim.
- 3. The proposed amendments raise new issues and requires further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1. Applicant argues in page 11, paragraph 3, "Applicant has amended Claim 2 to clarify that the tangible result is the use of less storage. Computer storage is an exhaustible, physical, resource. The claimed invention reduces usage of this physical resource and thus produces a tangible result." However, the proposed amendments raise new issues and will not be entered. Applicant's argument based on unentered amendments is, therefore, not persuasive. Furthermore, even if the proposed amendments will be entered, the newly added limitation, "wherein storing said decomposition requires less storage than storing said interaction matrix" appears to simply express the intended result without limiting a claim to a particular structure. In other words, the newly added wherein clause in a method claim may not be given any weight. Therefore, claim 2 as a whole still lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (abstract idea) since it fails to produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result and the argument will not be persuasive.